



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/771,097	02/02/2004	Adam Leslie Clark	40006997-0002-002	2044
8791	7590	09/27/2007	EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040			XU, KEVIN K	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				2628
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		09/27/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/771,097	CLARK, ADAM LESLIE	
	Examiner Kevin K. Xu	Art Unit 2628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/7/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Firstly, applicant has requested that objection of drawings in Fig. 4, wherein the numbers of red value and blue value for green value of pixels 3 and 4 appear incorrect, to be removed and has subsequently referenced paragraph 57. Nonetheless, it should be noted that while pixels 3 and 4 indeed appear to unscaled in terms of R and B values and derived from table 350, there is inconsistency concerning pixel 2 (table 420), which appears to be scaled in luminance and chrominance based on table 320, but nonetheless does not consist of data values for G, B nor proper scaling for luminance values that correspond to the value in table 350 utilizing the scaling of table 320. Thus, the said objection stands.

Additionally applicant has argued that Satoh does not anticipate claims 1, 19 and 20 under 35 USC 102. Examiner respectfully disagrees. First applicant has argued that Satoh teaches decompressing image data whereas the claim requires decoding video data. It should be noted that it is well known in the art that decompressing image data may be considered a type of decoding said data. Furthermore applicant has argued that the quantization tables of Satoh are fundamentally different from the table of encoded pixel parameters values claimed by applicant and additionally the quantization tables do not represent pixel data. Examiner respectfully disagrees. It should be noted that quantization tables as taught by Satoh (Fig. 7) explicitly teaches pixels in an 8 by 8 pixel block correspond to and are to be de-quantized (for decompression purposes)

utilizing the 8 by 8 quantization table in Fig. 7 and the data represented corresponding to each pixel of the 8 by 8 block is luminance color component.

Furthermore it should be noted that Satoh does teach scaling (quantizing) a set of segment reference pixel values according to each entry in the table of encoded (compressed) pixel parameter values (luminance/chrominance components for each pixel) to produce decoded pixel values. (dequantized, decompressed image) Again it should be noted that quantization by definition must include scaling of component values since it must divide each pixel component (Y, Cb, Cr) in the frequency domain by a constant of for that particular pixel component.

Additionally, applicant has argued that the quantization table of Satoh (Fig. 7) does not indicate or represent a dominant color component. It should be noted that current claim language does not require each pixel represented in the table wherein each entry requires a dominant pixel color component. Rather the current claim language merely requires “each pixel is represented in the table by an entry, the entry including a dominant pixel color component.” In other words, the entry in said claims may pertain to the entire quantization table of Fig. 7 for example, and the dominant pixel color component included in this entry is 121. Lastly applicant has argued that Satoh refers to compression/decompression of static images and thus, does not teach decoding video data. Examiner respectfully disagrees. As noted above decompression of image data is well known in the art as a type of decoding of said data and Satoh necessitates video data by teaching compression is done on motion picture data one frame at a time.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 5, 9-11, 13, 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Satoh (6597815)

Regarding claim 1, Satoh teaches decoding on a pixel-by-pixel basis, audio/video data using a table of encoded pixel parameter values, wherein each pixel is represented in the table by an entry including a dominate pixel color component. (Col 1 lines 16-59, Col 2 lines 15-18, Col 3 lines 15-47, Col 5 lines 13-19, Col 5 line 50-Col 6 line 65, Col 8 lines 11-22, Col 9 lines 18-26, Col 9 lines 58-64, Col 10 lines 49-60, Col 11 lines 4-61, Figs 5-7) It should be noted that Satoh teaches each of the pixels in an 8 by 8 pixel block corresponds to are to be de-quantized (for decompression purposes) utilizing the 8 by 8 quantization tables in Fig. 7. Thus, the quantization table (entry) for luminance or chrominance color components must include a dominant color component (for example the dominant luminance color component for the quantization table is 121) which corresponds to one of the 64 pixels on the 8 by 8 pixel block image that is to be decoded as seen in Fig. 7. Furthermore Satoh teaches scaling a set of segment reference pixels comprised of segment reference pixel values according to each entry in

Art Unit: 2628

the table of encoded pixel parameter values to produce decoded pixels comprised of decoded pixel parameter values. (Col 10 lines 49-60, Col 11 lines 4-61, Figs 5-7) It should be noted that Satoh teaches de-quantization by multiplying the decoded data with the quantization levels included in the quantization tables (scaling of segment reference pixel values according to each entry in the table of encoded pixel parameter values) and thus, producing decoded pixels comprising of decoded pixel parameter values. Furthermore Satoh teaches displaying the decoded pixels (Col 8 lines 36-45, Fig. 5).

Claim 20 is similar in scope to claim 1 except for the recitation of a machine readable medium storing a set of instructions that, when executed by the machine, cause the machine to execute the a method of claim 1. Satoh also teaches this. (Col 22 lines 38-54, Fig. 1)

Claim 19 is similar in scope to claim 1 except for the recitation of wherein each pixel is represented by a single pixel entry. Again under the same rationale as claim 1, claim 19 does not require each pixel to be represented by only a signal color component in each color entry but instead merely requires representation by a single color entry. This is taught by Satoh because Satoh teaches quantization tables (entries) which contain color component values including a dominant color component (in Fig. 7A for example 121) Furthermore, Satoh teaches a segment is a fractional portion of the frame by teaching a frame as image data for one page and a segment as pixel blocks (8

by 8 pixels) divided from the page and decompression to be performed for every pixel block. (Col 1 lines 16-38)

Regarding claim 2, Satoh teaches wherein each set of segment reference pixels corresponds to an encoded segment of a frame. (Col 1 lines 16-59, Col 2 lines 15-18, Col 3 lines 15-47, Col 5 lines 13-19, Col 5 line 50-Col 6 line 65, Col 8 lines 11-22, Col 9 lines 18-26, Col 9 lines 58-64, Col 10 lines 49-60, Col 11 lines 4-61, Figs 5-7) Again, the encoded segment of a frame as taught by Satoh is shown in Figs. 3 and 4.

Regarding claim 3, Satoh teaches a unique set of color pixels for the encoded segment and wherein each segment reference pixel represents a pixel with a most intense dominant pixel color component. (Col 10 lines 49-60, Col 11 lines 4-61, Figs 5-7) Again it should be noted that Satoh teaches for each pixel block (segment) the quantization table (entry) for luminance or chrominance color components must include a dominant color component (for example the dominant luminance color component for the quantization table is 121).

Regarding claim 5, Satoh teaches wherein the table of encoded pixel parameter values further comprises luminance/chrominance. (Col 10 lines 49-60, Col 11 lines 4-61, Fig. 7)

Regarding claim 9, Satoh teaches wherein the table of encoded pixel parameter values further comprises non-dominant pixel color components. (Col 10 lines 49-60, Col 11 lines 4-61, Fig. 7) It should be noted that the quantization table for luminance components for example comprises of a dominant color component 121 and other non-dominant color components (all other values not being 121).

Regarding claim 10, Satoh teaches wherein set of segment reference pixels are comprised of full-scale pixel parameter values. (Col 1 lines 16-59, Col 2 lines 15-18, Col 3 lines 15-47, Col 5 lines 13-19, Col 5 line 50-Col 6 line 65, Col 8 lines 11-22, Col 9 lines 18-26, Col 9 lines 58-64) It should be noted that the pixel block image data (segments) prior to full compression (encoding) may be considered full-scale.

Regarding claim 11, Satoh teaches scaling each of the full-scale pixel parameter values with the each corresponding encoded pixel parameter values. (Col 1 lines 16-59, Col 2 lines 15-18, Col 3 lines 15-47, Col 5 lines 13-19, Col 5 line 50-Col 6 line 65, Col 8 lines 11-22, Col 9 lines 18-26, Col 9 lines 58-64, Figs 3-4) It should be noted that Satoh teaches scaling each of the pixel blocks (8 by 8 pixels) utilizing a corresponding 8 by 8 quantization table to perform scaling. (Figs. 3-4)

Regarding claim 13, Satoh teaches prior to decoding the audio/video data, receiving a file including the table of encoded pixel parameter values and the set of segment reference pixel values. (Col 1 lines 16-59, Col 2 lines 15-18, Col 3 lines 15-47, Col 5 lines 13-19, Col 5 line 50-Col 6 line 65, Col 8 lines 11-22, Col 9 lines 18-26, Col 9 lines 58-64, Figs 3-4) Again it should be noted that prior to decoding, the video data is first received with quantization table for encoding purposes.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 16, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Satoh. (6597815)

Regarding claim 4, Satoh does not explicitly teach segment reference pixels comprises of red, green, blue and black pixels. Examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art to have pictures comprising of all 4 of those said pixels. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of representing a picture with red, green blue and black pixels in the system of Satoh because utilizing quantization of color values such as red, green, blue and black components provides the functionality of providing decompression for additional color models to be realized.

Regarding claim 16 Satoh teaches after scaling, communicating the decoded pixels onto a computer to be displayed. However Satoh does not explicitly teach a playback device. Examiner takes official notice that Windows OS supports many existing playback devices (such as windows media player) to synchronize video data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of communicating decoded pixels to a playback device because providing the functionality of synchronizing video content with digital audio content and thus, allowing users to listen to music at real-time can be achieved.

Regarding claim 18, Satoh teaches prior to communicating decoded pixel parameter values to the playback device, converting decoded pixel parameter values to

Art Unit: 2628

another display format. (Fig. 5) It should be noted that Satoh teaches color space conversion to RGB prior to displaying the image.

Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Satoh (6597815) in view of Crawford (5416614)

Regarding claim 6, It should be noted that Satoh does teach luminance and chrominance tables utilized for quantization (decompression and compression). Satoh does not explicitly teach segment reference pixel values comprises a dominant color pixel value, nondominant pixel color values, luminance and chrominance values. This is what Crawford teaches. (Col 6 line 9- Col 7 line 59) It should be noted that Satoh teaches entries in a table for R, G, B, Cr, Cb and Y values. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of tables of pixel values comprising a dominant color pixel value, nondominant pixel color values, luminance and chrominance values into the system of Satoh because enabling reversible conversion between two representations of an image in color space where look-up tables are used to represent the conversion between two color space can be achieved (Col 4 lines 21-31) and thus, enabling multiple conversions of image between one color space and another with minimal distortion to the data representation image. (Col 2 lines 40-43)

Regarding claim 7, it should be noted Satoh teaches scaling segment reference pixel's luminance and chrominance values utilizing a quantization table for each component. However Satoh does not explicitly teach utilizing a table for dominant color pixel value, nondominant pixel color values, luminance and chrominance values. This is

what Crawford teaches. (Col 6 line 9- Col 7 line 59) It should be noted that Satoh teaches entries in a table for R, G, B, Cr, Cb and Y values. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of tables of pixel values comprising a dominant color pixel value, nondominant pixel color values, luminance and chrominance values into the system of Satoh because enabling reversible conversion between two representations of an image in color space where look-up tables are used to represent the conversion between two color space can be achieved (Col 4 lines 21-31) and thus, enabling multiple conversions of image between one color space and another with minimal distortion to the data representation image. (Col 2 lines 40-43) Thus, by utilizing a quantization table for all 4 components, the same scaling (quantization) would be performed on all 4 components.

Claims 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Satoh (6597815) in view of Ladwig. (6247014)

Regarding claim 8, Ladwig teaches where each one of redundant entries (in a table) is utilized by recalling previously values associated with each of the redundant entries. (Col 2 lines 10-12; Col 6 lines 6-11, Fig. 11) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a pointer for redundant entries (in a table) into the system of Satoh because the pointer may be used as reference to explicitly tie one piece of redundant structure to another, allowing tables and/or lists to be better managed by the user.

Claim 12, 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Satoh (6597815) in view of Koshiba (6933970)

Regarding claim 12, Koshiba teaches synchronizing audio data associated with decoded video parameter values. (Col 33 line 37- Col 36 line 39) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize synchronizing audio data with decoded data into the system of Satoh because video decoding could be fast or slower than real-time audio requirement and thus improving the quality of playback, playback synchronization can be achieved. (Col 33 lines 38-48)

Regarding claim 17, Koshiba teaches communicating and synchronizing audio data to the playback device. (Col 33 line 37- Col 36 line 39) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize synchronizing audio data with decoded data into the system of Satoh because video decoding could be fast or slower than real-time audio requirement and thus improving quality of playback, playback synchronization can be achieved. (Col 33 lines 38-48)

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Satoh (6597815) in view of Basso. (6751623)

Regarding claim 14, Basso teaches a header comprised of video fram information and audio information. (Col 2 lines 53-65, Col 5 lines 47-63, Col 6 lines 23-32, Fig.1) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of a header into the system of Satoh because allowing access to important information about access units without having to parse the actual underlying encoded media data can be achieved. (Col 5 lines 59-63)

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Satoh (6597815) in view of Basso (6751623) in further view of Boice. (6999511)

Regarding claim 15, Boice teaches using a header to determine data locations within the file, including the beginning and end of the values. (Col 10 lines 35-48, Fig. 10) It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of a header to determine data locations within the file, including the beginning and end of the values into the system of Satoh in order to determine data locations including beginning and end of encoded pixel parameter values and corresponding segment reference pixel values because providing to the user additional information about the image such as the beginning and end of the image file can be realized.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin K. Xu whose telephone number is 571-272-7747. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Zimmerman can be reached on 571-272-7653. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KX

Kevin Xu

9/21/07



MARK ZIMMERMAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600